

RESOLUTIONS 1991-1992SESSION

Resolution No.	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Action	Remarks and/or Committee Referral
91/1	5/10/91	A Resolution to Establish Additional Procedures for the Prompt Disposition of Faculty Senate Resolutions Requesting Administrative Action or Action by the Board of Trustees	Adopted, as amended, 5/10/91	
91/2	10/11/91	A Resolution to Permit Faculty to Review their Annual Reports	Adopted 10/11/91	
91/3	10/11/91	A Resolution to Implement Recommendation 8 on the Use of Faculty on Administrative Committees, Subcommittees, Task Forces and Working Groups	Adopted, as amended, 10/11/91	
91/4	10/11/91	A Resolution to Implement Recommendation 15 to Establish a Joint Faculty-Administration Committee to Explore Ways to Improve the Flow of Information within the University Community	Adopted 10/11/91	
91/5	12/13/91	A Resolution to Amend the <u>Faculty Organization Plan</u> with Regard to the Composition of the Faculty Senate and Executive Committee to Conform with the Merger of the College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences	Adopted 12/13/91	Approved by the Bd May 21, 1992
91/6	1/17/92	A Substitute Resolution to Amend the <u>Faculty Code</u> to Establish School-Wide Personnel Committees	Postponed 1/17/92 to 2/14/92; postponed to 3/13/92 Adopted, as amended, 3/13/92	Approved by the Bd May 21, 1992
(continued)				

RESOLUTIONS 1991-1992 SESSION

Resolution No.	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Action	Remarks and/or Committee Referral
91/7	3/13/92	A Resolution to Amend the <u>Faculty Code</u> Respecting the Date of Appointment Notification	Adopted 3/13/92	<i>Approved by Bd May 21, 1992</i>
91/8	4/3/92 Special Meeting	A Substitute Resolution on Fringe Benefits Reallocation	Adopted, as amended, 4/3/92	
91/9	4/10/92	A Resolution to Amend Previously Adopted Substitute Resolution 91/6 to Conform to Existing Language of the <u>Faculty Code</u> and <u>Procedures</u>	Adopted 4/10/92	<i>approved by Bd May 21, 1992</i>
91/10	4/10/92	A Resolution of Appreciation for William B. Griffith	Adopted by Acclamation 4/10/92	
91/11	4/10/92	A Resolution Requesting Reconsideration of the Construction of the Proposed Health and Wellness Center	Referred, 4/10/92 <i>Defeated 5/8/92</i>	Referred to the Executive Committee; subsequently referred to the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee



THE PRESIDENT

TO: Professor Lilien Robinson
FROM: Stephen J. Trachtenberg
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Resolutions/1991-92 Session
DATE: June 29, 1992

Lilien: Enclosed you will find the Administration's responses to Resolutions from the Faculty Senate for the 1991-92 term. It may be useful to note that Resolution 91/11 which we responded to with "Held over for action by the next Senate" was, as you know, acted upon at the first meeting of the 1992-93 Senate. The Senate defeated the Resolution. I believe there was only one vote for it. Thus, we presume that it's moot.

SJT/hdi
Enclosure
cc+: Dr. Roderick French
Professor William Griffith

(Dictated but not seen by President Trachtenberg; mailed in his absence to avoid delay)

Administration Response to Resolutions from the Faculty Senate

1991-92 Term

Resolution 91/1: *A Resolution to Establish Additional Procedures for the Prompt Disposition of Faculty Senate Resolutions Requesting Administrative Action or Action by the Board of Trustees*

Response: **Noted.**

Resolution 91/2: *A Resolution to Permit Faculty to Review their Annual Reports*

Response: **Noted with the observation that this seems a prescription for blandness and diminished usefulness of Annual Reports. An experiment will be made in the fall semester of 1992 with mechanics of implementing the fairly complicated process. The Administration reserves the option of returning with a request for reconsideration.**

Resolution 91/3: *A Resolution to Implement Recommendation 8 on the Use of Faculty on Administrative Committees, Sub-committees, Task Forces and Working Groups*

Response: **The Administration reserves the right to create committees to help inform its thinking and to invite to serve on those committees persons whom it deems most appropriate. We do not believe this is in conflict with the intent of 91/3.**

Resolution 91/4: *A Resolution to Implement Recommendation 15 to Establish a Joint Faculty-Administration Committee to Explore Ways to Improve the Flow of Information within the University Community*

Response: **Under way.**

Resolution 91/5: *A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Organization Plan with Regard to the Composition of the Faculty Senate and Executive Committee to Conform with the Merger of the College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences*

Response: **Sent forward by the Administration and approved by the Board of Trustees.**

Resolution 91/6: *A Substitute Resolution to Amend the Faculty Code to Establish School-Wide Personnel Committees*

Response: **Sent forward by the Administration and Approved by the Board of Trustees.**

Resolution 91/7: *A resolution to Amend the Faculty Code Respecting the Date of Appointment Notification*

Response: **Sent forward by the Administration and Approved by the Board of Trustees.**

Resolution 91/8: *A substitute Resolution on Fringe Benefits Reallocation*

Response: **Accepted.**

Resolution 91/9: *A Resolution to Amend Previously Adopted Substitute Resolution 91/6 to Conform to Existing Language of the Faculty Code and Procedures*

Response: **Incorporated in the action on 91/6.**

Resolution 91/10: *A Resolution of Appreciation for William B. Griffith*

Response: **Noted with pleasure.**

Resolution 91/11: *A Resolution Requesting Reconsideration of the Construction of the Proposed Health and Wellness Center*

Response: **Held over for action by the next Senate.**

*Instructions pertaining to Resolutions approved by the Senate
requiring the President's and/or Board's actions.*

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Trangsrud, Chair, PEAFC Committee, Ext. 4-8173]

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES FOR THE PROMPT DISPOSITION OF FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS REQUESTING ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION OR ACTION BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES (91/1)

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom has reviewed the process by which Resolutions of the Faculty Senate are received by the University Administration; and

WHEREAS, the Committee believes that additional procedures are appropriate to assure that Faculty Senate Resolutions receive prompt consideration by the University Administration or the Board of Trustees; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

(1) That the Faculty Senate directs the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to forward all Faculty Senate Resolutions directed to the University Administration in a prompt and timely manner and to request of the University Administration, on a periodic basis, a report about its position on the matters contained in the Resolution, and, if appropriate, a report on its plans to implement the Resolution;

(2) That the Faculty Senate directs the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to report back to the Faculty Senate within a reasonable time, not to exceed one year from date of approval, the reaction of the University Administration and, where relevant, the Board of Trustees on all Resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate;

(3) That the Faculty Senate directs ~~the Chair of~~ the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to add to the agenda of the Faculty Senate for its ~~reconsideration~~ consideration any previously approved Faculty Senate Resolution not acted upon by the University Administration or, where relevant, the Board of Trustees in a timely manner;

(4) In the event the University Administration declines in a timely manner to forward an approved Faculty Senate Resolution to the Board of Trustees for its consideration when the Resolution requests action by the Board of Trustees, and the Faculty Senate reaffirms its approval of the Resolution under RESOLVING clause (3) above, that the Faculty Senate directs the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to request approval from the Faculty Senate to seek the concurrence of the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees in adding the relevant Faculty Senate Resolution to the agenda of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees at its next meeting; and

(5) That the procedures established by this Resolution apply to all Faculty Senate Resolutions passed after the date this Resolution is approved.

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
April 1, 1991

Adopted, as amended, May 10, 1991

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Trangsrud, Chair, PEA Committee, Ext. 4-8173]

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES FOR THE
PROMPT DISPOSITION OF FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS
REQUESTING ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION OR ACTION BY THE BOARD
OF TRUSTEES (91/1)

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom has reviewed the process by which Resolutions of the Faculty Senate are received by the University Administration; and

WHEREAS, the Committee believes that additional procedures are appropriate to assure that Faculty Senate Resolutions receive prompt consideration by the University Administration or the Board of Trustees; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

(1) That the Faculty Senate directs the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to forward all Faculty Senate Resolutions directed to the University Administration in a prompt and timely manner and to request of the University Administration, on a periodic basis, a report about its position on the matters contained in the Resolution, and, if appropriate, a report on its plans to implement the Resolution;

(2) That the Faculty Senate directs the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to report back to the Faculty Senate within a reasonable time, not to exceed one year from date of approval, the reaction of the University Administration and, where relevant, the Board of Trustees on all Resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate;

(3) That the Faculty Senate directs the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to add to the agenda of the Faculty Senate for its reconsideration consideration any previously approved Faculty Senate Resolution not acted upon by the University Administration or, where relevant, the Board of Trustees in a timely manner;

(4) In the event the University Administration declines in a timely manner to forward an approved Faculty Senate Resolution to the Board of Trustees for its consideration when the Resolution requests action by the Board of Trustees, and the Faculty Senate reaffirms its approval of the Resolution under RESOLVING clause (3) above, that the Faculty Senate directs the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to request approval from the Faculty Senate to seek the concurrence of the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees in adding the relevant Faculty

Senate Resolution to the agenda of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees at its next meeting; and

(5) That the procedures established by this Resolution apply to all Faculty Senate Resolutions passed after the date this Resolution is approved.

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
April 1, 1991

Adopted, as amended, May 10, 1991

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Hill, Chair, ASPP Committee, Ext. 4-6761].

A RESOLUTION TO PERMIT FACULTY TO REVIEW THEIR ANNUAL REPORTS
(91/2)

WHEREAS, fairness and good policy suggest that Faculty be permitted to review and comment on statements which chairs and/or deans append to their annual reports; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

(1) That, beginning in the fall semester of 1992, the Vice President for Academic Affairs designate a two-week period during which Faculty have the opportunity to review and, if they wish, to respond in writing to comments which chairs and/or deans have appended to their annual reports; and

(2) That an entry be added to the annual report form, to wit:

"I have read the comments on my annual report
and understand that, if I choose, I may provide
additional comments."

and;

(3) That written responses be forwarded through the chair and/or dean, together with the annual report, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, by the end of the two-week response period.

Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion
Policies (including Fringe Benefits)
September 23, 1991

Adopted October 11, 1991

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Garriss, Executive Committee, Ext. 4-3646].

A RESOLUTION TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATION 8 ON THE USE OF FACULTY ON ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES, SUBCOMMITTEES, TASK FORCES AND WORKING GROUPS (91/3) *w/ Report*

WHEREAS, effective communication among the constituent elements of the University community is essential to the achievement of success across the full range of institutional objectives; and

WHEREAS, the faculty seeks to enhance its role and influence as a constituent in the University community through improved communication in a manner that would serve the University's larger need to develop and sustain unified responses to the challenges of operating in today's uniquely difficult environment; and

WHEREAS, such effective communication is best achieved by the participation of legitimate representatives of the faculty on administrative committees, and designation by the Faculty Senate legitimizes standing as a representative of the faculty; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That, under normal circumstances, no faculty members should be appointed as representatives of the faculty by a University administrator to any committee (including all ad hoc committees, task forces, and working groups), or to any liaison function, without consultation with and the approval of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee; and

(2) That all faculty members named as representatives of the faculty on administrative committees assume an affirmative obligation to report to the Faculty Senate on a regular basis on the activities of their respective committees.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
September 27, 1991

Adopted, as amended, October 11, 1991

Report on Recommendation 8 of the
Special Committee to Study the Structure and Functioning
of the Senate

by C. A. Garriss, 9/27/91

Recommendation 8:

No faculty members should be appointed by a University administrator to any committee (including all ad hoc committees and working groups), or to any liaison function, without consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. All faculty members appointed to committees assume an affirmative obligation to report to the Faculty Senate on a regular basis on the activities of their respective committees.

Committee's Rationale:

1. A central goal of the Senate is to enhance the role and influence of the faculty as a constituent of the University community through improved communication, but, in a manner that would serve the University's larger need to develop and sustain unified responses to the challenges of operating in today's uniquely difficult environment.
2. Faculty appointed by administrators without Senate approval are not legitimate representatives of the faculty. Without such legitimization, it is widely perceived among the faculty that the administration is relying increasingly on these less formal structures at the expense of their formal counterparts to circumvent the potential influence of the duly elected representatives of the faculty. Committee members selected without Senate endorsement or contact do not have the authority to speak as representatives of the faculty (although they are nevertheless called upon to do so).
3. Faculty who serve on administrative committees without Senatorial endorsement do not have a specific mechanism, or even mandate, to keep a defined faculty constituency apprised of their efforts or ground their actions in faculty approbation. As a result, decision-making in such groups may be more efficient than might otherwise be the case, but it may be deficient in its effectiveness broadly defined.
4. The relationship between a faculty and an administration inevitably entails a balancing of deliberation with action, of institutional conservatism with change, and of the traditional adversarial character of faculty-administration relations. These issues are of particular salience in the structuring and use of committees since such groups represent the coming together of potentially divergent interests at what is typically, in operational terms, a level of genuine decision-making.

President's Response:

The involvement of faculty in administrative committees has been demonstrated to be profitable in the past and there is every intention to persist in the future. The administration will endeavor to consult with the Faculty Senate, as appropriate, in considering the designation of faculty members to its committees, subcommittees, task forces, etc. However, it seems unnecessarily restrictive and perhaps unsound to state as a matter of categorical procedure, that all faculty appointments to administrative committees and task forces "should be made in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate". We would not anticipate that there would be many occasions when consultation is overlooked or determined inappropriate but we would be reluctant to surrender flexibility as a matter of policy.

Recommended Response of Executive Committee

It is clearly the administration's prerogative to solicit assistance and consultation from the faculty in order to assist them in advancing the interests of the university without consultation or endorsement of the Senate. Such individual faculty may be selected because of their unique expertise, working relationships with administrators, or for whatever profound or arbitrary reason that the administration deems appropriate. However, it is the position of the Senate that in the absence of such consultation with the Senate Executive Committee, such faculty are not to be construed as legitimate representatives of the faculty. All faculty endorsed by the Senate Executive Committee to serve on administrative groups would be expected to report their actions to designated faculty constituencies. It is also the position of the Senate that administrative committees with legitimate faculty representatives better serve the interests of the university by virtue of their actions being grounded in faculty approbation and their interactive relationships with interested faculty groups. Such relationships between administration and faculty engender a spirit of cooperation which serves the university well.

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Divita, Executive Committee, Ext. 4-6203].

A RESOLUTION TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATION 15 TO ESTABLISH A JOINT FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE TO EXPLORE WAYS TO IMPROVE THE FLOW OF INFORMATION WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY (91/4)

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate established the Special Committee to Study the Structure and Functioning of the Faculty Senate, and the Special Committee submitted its report to the Faculty Senate on March 22, 1991; and

WHEREAS, Recommendation 15 of the Committee's report focuses on the need to improve the flow of information within the University community, and President Trachtenberg is supportive of the thrust of Recommendation 15; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

(1) That, a Joint Faculty-Administration Committee be established to explore the merits of Recommendation 15; and

(2) That such a committee consist of six members: three members of the faculty appointed by the Executive Committee and three members of the administration appointed by the President; and

(3) That the leadership of this committee be shared by one member of the faculty designated by the Faculty Senate and one member of the administration designated by the President; and

(4) That the committee present a written report of its findings and recommendations in the Spring 92 semester, accompanied by a cost/benefit analysis of its recommendations; and

(5) That the Co-Chairs of the committee maintain an active liaison with the designated member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee during the period of the committee's existence.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
September 27, 1991

Adopted October 11, 1991

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Griffith, Executive Committee, Ext. 4-6265]

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN WITH REGARD TO THE COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY SENATE AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO CONFORM WITH THE MERGER OF THE COLLEGE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES (91/5)

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees on October 17, 1991, approved the proposed merger of the College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, effective July 1, 1992; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan currently allocates a separate seat in the Faculty Senate and on the Senate's Executive Committee to represent the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences as a separate entity, one which will in the future no longer exist; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That the President, as Chairman of the Faculty Assembly, is requested to place on the agenda of the Faculty Assembly at the earliest opportunity two amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan, as follows:

(a) Article III, Section 2, subsection (a)(3) be amended to read:

"The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: Columbian College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, nine; the Schools of Education and Human Development, Engineering and Applied Science, ~~Government and Business Administration~~ Business and Public Management, Medicine and Health Sciences, and the National Law Center, three each; and the Elliott School of International Affairs, one. ~~and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, one each.~~ The faculty members shall be professors. . . ."

(b) Article III, Section 5, subsection (b) be amended to read:

"The Executive Committee shall consist of seven faculty members of the Senate and the President ex officio. The following ~~six~~ seven schools shall have one representative each: the Columbian College and Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the National Law Center, the School of Education and Human Development, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, and the School of ~~Government and Business Administration~~ Business and Public Management, and the Elliott School of International Affairs. ~~The seventh seat shall alternate biennially between the Senate representatives of the School of International Affairs and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.~~ Any faculty member of the Senate shall be eligible. . . ."

(continued)

Resolution (91/5) continued

(2) Upon approval by the Faculty Assembly, the President is requested to forward at the earliest opportunity the proposed amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan to the Board of Trustees for final approval, to become effective July 1, 1992.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
November 22, 1991

Adopted December 13, 1991

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Hill, Chair, ASPP Committee, Ext. 4-6761]

A SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO ESTABLISH SCHOOL-WIDE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES (91/6)

WHEREAS, all academic units of the University are required by the Faculty Code (Art. IV-B and C) to publish their criteria for the tenure and promotion of regular full-time faculty; and

WHEREAS, school-wide personnel committees have served to assure uniformity in the application of these criteria in those schools where such committees have been established; and

WHEREAS, all faculty have a professional interest in the maintenance of high and uniform standards for tenure and promotion throughout the University; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- (1) THAT a new Section D be added to Article IV. of the Faculty Code to read:

(underlining indicates new language)

"D. School-wide Personnel Committees

To implement the procedures required in Sections B.3 and C.2. above, each school or college shall establish a school-wide personnel committee, either as an elected standing committee or of the school faculty acting as a committee of the whole, to consider recommendations for appointments with tenure, or against the reappointment, promotion or tenure of regular full-time faculty. Such committees may request additional information, documentation, or clarification respecting such recommendations. Further:

1. a- An elected standing committee, sitting in review of recommendations originating from a department or equivalent unit, shall advise the dean of that school or college ~~as to~~ whether the candidate has met the relevant school and department criteria, and ~~whether compelling reasons exist as to~~ whether it has identified any 'compelling reasons' which may exist for not following the faculty departmental or unit recommendation. Such advisories shall not be construed as 'faculty recommendations' as defined by Sec. B.3. of the Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code.

~~b- Such elected standing committees may also review departmental criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, and, as deemed appropriate, recommend that such criteria be clarified or specified more fully.~~

2. When the faculty of a school or college, sitting as a committee of the whole, serves as the school's personnel committee, and initiates recommendations to the dean for

(continued)

Substitute Resolution 91/6 (cont'd)

reappointment, promotion or tenure, such recommendations shall be construed as 'faculty recommendations' in the sense of the Procedures, Sec. B.3."

- (2) THAT Section D. of Article IV. "Nondiscrimination," be restyled "E. Nondiscrimination."

The foregoing substitute resolution was approved by the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies (on January 13 and February 11, 1992).

Postponed January 17, 1992, to the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, February 14, 1992

Deferred February 14, 1992, to the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, March 13, 1992

Adopted, as amended, March 13, 1992

A SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO ESTABLISH
SCHOOL-WIDE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES (91/6)

WHEREAS, all academic units of the University are required by the Faculty Code (Art. IV-B and C) to publish their criteria for the tenure and promotion of regular full-time faculty; and

WHEREAS, school-wide personnel committees have served to assure uniformity in the application of these criteria in those schools where such committees have been established; and

WHEREAS, all faculty have a professional interest in the maintenance of high and uniform standards for tenure and promotion throughout the University; NOW, THEREFORE
BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) THAT a new Section D be added to Article IV of the Faculty Code to read:

"D. School-wide Personnel Committees

To implement the procedures required in Sections B.3 and C.2. above, each school or college shall establish a school-wide personnel committee, either as an elected standing committee or of the school faculty acting as a committee of the whole, to consider recommendations for ~~or against the reappointment~~, promotion or tenure of regular full-time faculty. Such committees may request additional information, documentation, or clarification respecting such recommendations. Further:

*Amended
2/14/92*

1. a. An elected standing committee, sitting in review of recommendations originating from a department or equivalent unit, shall advise the dean of that school or college as to whether the candidate has met the relevant school and department criteria, and ~~whether compelling reasons exist~~ as to whether it has identified any 'compelling reasons' which may exist for not following the faculty recommendation. Such advisories shall not be construed as 'faculty recommendations' as defined by Sec. B.3. of the Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code.

~~b. Such elected standing committees may also review departmental criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, and, as deemed appropriate, recommend that such criteria be clarified or specified more fully.~~

2. When the faculty of a school or college, sitting as a committee of the whole, serves as the school's personnel committee, and initiates recommendations to the dean for

Substitute Resolution 91/6 (cont'd)

~~reappointment~~, promotion or tenure, such recommendations shall be construed as 'faculty recommendations' in the sense of the Procedures, Sec. B.3."

- (2) THAT Section D. of Article IV, "Nondiscrimination," be restyled "E. Nondiscrimination."

The foregoing substitute resolution was approved by the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies (and 13 January and 11 February, 1992).

Postponed January 17, 1992, to next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, February 14, 1992.

Deferred February 14, 1992, to the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, March 13, 1992

See Substitute 91/6 as amended

A SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION

~~A-RESOLUTION~~ TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO ESTABLISH SCHOOL-WIDE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES (91/6)

WHEREAS, all academic units of the University are required by the Faculty Code (Art. IV-B and C) to publish their criteria for the tenure and promotion of regular full-time faculty; and

WHEREAS, school-wide personnel committees have served to assure uniformity in the application of these criteria in those schools where such committees have been established; and

WHEREAS, all faculty have a professional interest in the maintenance of high and uniform standards for tenure and promotion throughout the University; NOW, THEREFORE
BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- (1) THAT a new Section D be added to Article IV of the Faculty Code to read:

"D. School-Wide Personnel Committees

To implement the procedures required in Sections B.3 and C.2 above, each school or college shall establish a school-wide personnel committee, either as an elected standing committee or of the school faculty acting as a committee of the whole, to consider recommendations for ~~or against the reappointment,~~ promotion, or tenure of regular full-time faculty. Such committees may request additional information, documentation, or clarification respecting such recommendations. Further:

1. a. An elected standing committee, sitting in review of recommendations originating from a department or equivalent unit, shall advise the dean of that school or college as to whether the candidate has met the relevant school and department criteria, and whether 'compelling reasons' exist for not following the faculty recommendation. Such advisories shall not be construed as 'faculty recommendations' as defined by Sec. B.3. of the Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code.

~~b.---Such-elected-standing-committees-may-also review-departmental-criteria-for-reappointment,-promotion,-and-tenure,-and,-as-deemed-appropriate,-recommend that-such-criteria-be-clarified-or-specified-more-fully.~~

2. When the faculty of a school or college, sitting as a committee of the whole, serves as the school's personnel committee, and initiates recommendations to the

(continued)

Substitute Resolution 91/6 (cont'd)

dean for ~~reappointment~~, promotion, or tenure, such recommendations shall be construed as 'faculty recommendations' in the sense of Procedures, Sec. B.3."

- (2) THAT Section D. of Article IV, "Nondiscrimination," be restyled "E. Nondiscrimination."

The foregoing substitute resolution was approved by the
Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (on 13 January 1992)

Postponed January 17, 1992, to the next regular meeting of the
Faculty Senate, February 14, 1992

See Substitute 91/6

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO ESTABLISH SCHOOL-WIDE PERSONNEL COMMITTEES (91/6)

WHEREAS, all academic units of the University are required by the Faculty Code (Art. IV-B and C) to publish their criteria for the tenure and promotion of regular full-time faculty; and

WHEREAS, school-wide personnel committees have served to assure uniformity in the application of these criteria in those schools where such committees have been established; and

WHEREAS, all faculty have a professional interest in the maintenance of high and uniform standards for tenure and promotion throughout the University; NOW, THEREFORE
BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- (1) THAT a new Section D be added to Article IV of the Faculty Code to read:

"D. School-Wide Personnel Committees

To implement the procedures required in Sections B.3 and C.2 above, each school or college shall establish a school-wide personnel committee, either as an elected standing committee or of the school faculty acting as a committee of the whole, to consider recommendations for or against the reappointment, promotion, or tenure of regular full-time faculty. Such committees may request additional information, documentation, or clarification respecting such recommendations. Further:

1. a. An elected standing committee, sitting in review of recommendations originating from a department or equivalent unit, shall advise the dean of that school or college as to whether the candidate has met the relevant school and department criteria, and whether 'compelling reasons' exist for not following the faculty recommendation. Such advisories shall not be construed as 'faculty recommendations' as defined by Sec. B.3. of the Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code.

b. Such elected standing committees may also review departmental criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, and, as deemed appropriate, recommend that such criteria be clarified or specified more fully.

2. When the faculty of a school or college, sitting as a committee of the whole, serves as the school's personnel committee, and initiates recommendations to the

(continued)

Resolution 91/6 (cont'd)

dean for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, such recommendations shall be construed as 'faculty recommendations' in the sense of Procedures, Sec. B.3."

- (2) THAT Section D. of Article IV, "Nondiscrimination," be restyled "E. Nondiscrimination."

Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies
January 6, 1992

January 1992

To: Members, Faculty Senate

Fr: Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion
Policies

Subj.: Committee Report on a Resolution to Establish School-wide
Personnel Committees by Amending the Faculty Code

The Faculty Code, by requiring all schools and departments to publish specific criteria for promotion and tenure, expresses a university-wide commitment to high professional standards. Initially missing from this commitment were mechanisms designed to assure that standards would be uniformly applied. Since the adoption of criteria, several schools have met this need by establishing school-wide personnel committees whose function is to review departmental recommendations and to advise the dean as to whether both school and departmental criteria have been met. A positive recommendation means that a dean can forward his own recommendation with assurance that criteria have been fulfilled and that excellence and promise have been recognized.

We have been made aware, however, that problems may arise when a personnel committee finds against a department's recommendation for promotion or tenure. Hypothetically or in practice, the department may at this point withdraw its recommendation. Or it may, as the Code provides, lay its recommendation before the dean. The proposed amendment does not vitiate a dean's responsibility to act on a departmental recommendation. Here the Code is explicit: personnel actions "shall normally follow faculty recommendations. Departures from this standard shall be limited to those cases involving compelling reasons." Moreover, the Code plainly intends that deans and departments be the opposing parties in nonconcurrence cases. The Code amendment we propose adheres to that intention. Personnel committees are not to be parties to nonconcurrences. Deans must still find "compelling reasons" for rejecting a departmental recommendation. Although a personnel committee may discover such reasons, and a dean may act on them, the committee's negative advisory cannot be in itself a "compelling reason" for a dean's rejection of a departmental recommendation. To assure that the dean's action alone be the basis for nonconcurrence proceedings, the proposed amendment expressly states that personnel committee "advisories shall not be construed as 'faculty recommendations' as defined by Section B of Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code." The exception to this construction would lie with schools in which a committee of the whole makes the recommendations for promotion or tenure. Such recommendations clearly constitute a

faculty recommendation within the meaning of Section B of the Code "Procedures."

Deans who are advised by personnel committees inform us that they welcome the advice of these committees in assuring that high and uniform standards are applied. Some faculty, however, have expressed doubts. Our report addresses those doubts in the context of the proposed amendment.

The Case for Uniformity

The Code requires all academic units, schools as well as departments, to "publish" their criteria for promotion and tenure. Departmental criteria tell what the faculty expects of their junior colleagues in terms of excellence and creativity peculiar to the discipline. School criteria tend to be more general in nature, although certain categories of accomplishment (in scholarship, teaching, and service) mirror the expectations of the departments. Where personnel committees exist, the school faculty has delegated responsibility to a representative body to assure that candidates have fulfilled both school and departmental criteria, and that the procedures stipulated by school and departmental bylaws have been followed.

Deans on whom the faculty rely to uphold the high standards they profess testify to the importance of having personnel (or APT) committees to monitor the judgment of departments. Dean Kenny writes: "Their ability to reach informed and independent conclusions acts as a check on the common instinct within a department for faculty members to support each other (or less often, to adopt a tacit 'pull up the gangplank' attitude to keep their own ranks from being enlarged)." Similarly, Dean Keimowitz writes: "I believe that in departments, perhaps particularly smaller ones, collegial relationships develop that can easily and understandably color important decisions. . . . Our AP&T Committee has traditionally considered its primary role to be the review of criteria for promotion, and has regularly rejected departmental recommendations if they feel the faculty member in question is not yet ready." From a somewhat different perspective, Dean East writes of the ESIA personnel committee that "it is also necessary as a check on those faculty who may, for a portion of their careers, choose to devote more time to School tasks at the expense of department responsibilities. In at least one case, the School personnel committee differed with the department recommendation. The School committee recommendation was followed."

Answering the Critics:

One critic of existing personnel committees writes: "The committees often demonstrate insensitivity to the needs and the resources of individual departments, and tend blindly to apply criteria characteristic of the committee members. . . . There are

departments which require expertise where creativity is more important than traditional scholarship, and there are departments who specialize in training, clinical work, and off-campus activities." Dean Kenny (CCAS and GSAS) takes an opposing view. He writes: "It is frequently objected that qualifications can best be judged by colleagues in the same discipline--a political scientist, for example, will have no basis for evaluating the qualifications of a physicist. The evidence of well over a decade in GSAS and nearly a decade in CCAS suggests otherwise; faculty members can inform themselves adequately to recognize work of high quality in whatever field. They are, of course, assisted by the materials presented to them, especially evaluations from non-university professional sources." Similarly, Dean Keimowitz writes: "There is little question that a small interdisciplinary committee does not always have the expertise to evaluate the scientific merit of some faculty members' credentials. This minor problem is controlled by carefully gathering and reviewing information from external reviewers. Furthermore, the broad interdisciplinary view of senior faculty has been most beneficial in raising the standards that we apply to these critical decisions."

Another criticism of existing personnel committees is that they may become over-zealous and inquire too minutely into the bases of a departmental recommendation. Be that as it may, we believe that the proposed Code amendment defines the reasonable extent of inquiry and, by that definition, the limits of inquiry. That is, a personnel committee can reasonably be expected to ask for more information, for more documented evidence of high quality, or for clarification of the standards and procedures that have preceded its review. If a department believes the committee to have been unreasonable, it may take its recommendation directly to the dean who, in turn, must find "compelling reasons" to reject it. Having a school-wide personnel committee admittedly involves more give and take. As Dean Kenny writes, "I have viewed the process as a ladder of review, each step of which, from department to Personnel Committee to Dean to Vice President, needs to be negotiated before action can be taken."

The argument is also heard that schools should have "local option," either to establish a personnel committee or to leave departmental recommendations to the judgment of the dean. The force of this argument lies in the Code's ultimate juxtaposing of dean and department as the sole parties to nonconcurrence cases. Only the dean (or Vice President) has the authority to reject a departmental recommendation, and only for compelling reasons. Why not, then, let the dean alone find the compelling reasons lest there be (as one critic puts it) "a loss of collegiality when one group of faculty stands off against another?"

As a counter-argument, personnel committees not only act as a check on departments; they also act as a potential check on deans--deans who may be perceived to be (however unlikely) overworked, indifferent, hostile, prone to play favorites, etc.,

etc. Moreover, it is, or should be, an article of faculty faith that deans generally make better decisions when they have faculty advice. The principal argument against "local option," however, is that faculty and deans alike share a common interest in maintaining high and uniform standards for promotion and tenure. In schools that have personnel committees, we have assurance that those standards are being met. Again, to quote Dean Kenny. " "...without at all disparaging the senior faculty, I believe it is true that the level of accomplishment of faculty promoted in recent years exceeds that of those promoted before the [CCAS and GSAS] Committees existed." And from Dean Keimowitz: "Our senior and small interdisciplinary AP&T committee has been pivotal in formulating the policies by which faculty should be considered for promotion and tenure, and also in acting as the institutional barometer to ensure the rigorous and fair application of these principles."

Finally, convinced that all faculty have a professional stake in the quality of all schools, we urge the adoption of the amendment.

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Hill, Chair, ASPP Committee, Ext. 4-6761]

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE RESPECTING THE DATE OF APPOINTMENT NOTIFICATION (91/7)

WHEREAS, the annual appointment/reappointment letters can no longer be processed and mailed by the Code-specified date of "on or about April 1"; and

WHEREAS, good policy suggests that the Faculty Code accurately state those University procedures to which the Code alludes; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

- (1) That Section IV. A. 1. b. of the Faculty Code be amended to read:
 - b) "Tenured members of the faculty and faculty members whose appointments do not expire or whose appointments will be renewed shall be notified in writing annually, on or about ~~April 1~~, May 7, of salary and of changes in rank or of other terms and conditions of service for the next academic year."

Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion
Policies (including Fringe Benefits)
February 25, 1992

Adopted March 13, 1992

A SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION ON FRINGE BENEFITS REALLOCATION (91/8)

WHEREAS, today the Faculty Senate will have heard the Administration's proposals for reallocating the University's fringe benefits dollars from retirement to health insurance (without reducing its total contribution); and

WHEREAS, the Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies has, after lengthy study, concurred in the perceived needs and principles underlying these proposals: NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

{1} THAT given the University's intention to increase its monthly contributions to the steadily rising cost of health insurance, the Faculty Senate accepts the formula by which the University's contributions to retirement programs will be correspondingly reduced; ~~further,~~ provided that

~~{2}-THAT-the-Faculty-Senate-strongly-recommends-that~~ any present and future "savings" realized from ~~such this~~ reductions be retained within the pool of fringe benefits, specifically committed to the stabilization of health insurance premiums- in future years.

Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies
(including Fringe Benefits)
April 3, 1992

Adopted, as amended, April 3, 1992

see Substitute Resolution (91/8)
(preceding page)

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to
Professor Hill, Chair, ASPP Committee, Ext. 4-6761]

A RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE A NEW PERCENTAGE FORMULA FOR BASE AND
MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY'S RETIREMENT BENEFITS
(91/8)

WHEREAS, the Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies
Committee has unanimously approved and now submits to the
Senate its "Report and Recommendation on the Reallocation of
Funds within the Fringe Benefits Package"; and

WHEREAS, the Committee believes that a faculty recommenda-
tion should go forward to the President, concurrently with the
recommendation of the Benefits Review Committee; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY;

- . THAT the Faculty Senate endorse the percentage formula
for base and matching contributions to retirement benefits
which appears on Page 2 of the attached Committee Report.

Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies
(including Fringe Benefits)
March 10, 1992

March 10, 1992

To: The Faculty Senate of the George Washington University

Fr: The Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies

Report and Recommendation on the Reallocation of Funds within the
Fringe Benefits Package

The Committee's recommendation, below, is based on the well-argued premise that the University cannot at this time afford to fund fringe benefits in excess of 25% of total salary expense. Within this constraint, the steep increase now projected for health insurance premiums suggests the wisdom of shifting University funds from retirement benefits to health benefits. (Without such a reallocation, next year's salary raises for less well paid employees will be reduced, perhaps wiped out.) Increasing the University's contribution to health insurance premiums, however, means that "savings" must be effected in the other major component of fringe benefits: the retirement program.

Specifically, the Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee concurs in the view of the Benefits Review Committee that "a reallocation of benefit dollars from the retirement program to health insurance benefits is appropriate, desirable, and necessary at this time."

Together, our two committees have sought to devise a formula for employer/employee contributions to a modified retirement program that has the following features:

- (1) frees up sufficient University funds for a necessary increase in the University's contributions to employees' health insurance premiums;
- (2) sets the University's base contribution to a retirement program at 4%, irrespective of employee contribution;
- (3) allows employees to contribute matching funds on a one-to-one percentage basis up to a combined total contribution of 16%;
- (4) allows newly-hired, previously-benefitting faculty to receive the University contributions to retirement on a non-vested basis until the end of their third year of employment; and
- (5) complies with federal standards for economic non-discrimination.

(Note: Under Item 4, above, the saving that might have been effected by delaying a new employee's eligibility for the University's contribution to retirement for a three-year period would have made it difficult to hire new faculty, laterally, from institutions where they had participated in such programs. Under the proposed formula, newly-hired faculty (and employees generally) would receive the University contribution from the outset of employment, but that contribution would not be vested until the end of the third year.)

The proposed formula for base and matching contributions is as follows:

GW Match				
GW	1% for 1%	Indiv.	Total	Total
Contr.	to Max of 6%	Contr.	GW contr.	GW & Indiv.
4%	0%	0%	4%	4%
4%	1%	1%	5%	6%
4%	2%	2%	6%	8%
4%	3%	3%	7%	10%
4%	4%	4%	8%	12%
4%	5%	5%	9%	14%
4%	6%	6%	10%	16%

The BRC and ASPP Committees endorse this formula for the reallocation of benefit dollars, noting in the words of the BRC report that this is "not a recommendation for an overall reduction in fringe benefits, but for a careful and deliberate reallocation of one benefit to another." The overlapping membership of the two committees has produced a high degree of cooperation throughout lengthy and exhaustive deliberations. The Senate Committee is satisfied that no better alternative can be devised.

So that a Faculty recommendation may go forward to the President concurrently with the recommendation of the Benefits Review Committee, we ask the Faculty Senate to take appropriate action on this report and recommendation.

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor William B. Griffith, Chair, Executive Committee, Ext. 4-6265]

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED SUBSTITUTE
RESOLUTION 91/6 TO CONFORM TO EXISTING LANGUAGE OF THE
FACULTY CODE AND PROCEDURES (91/9)

WHEREAS, the new Paragraph D. of Article IV. approved by the Faculty Senate on March 13, 1992, in adopting Resolution 91/6 amending the Faculty Code, specifies in Sec. 2. that when the faculty of a school or college sitting as a committee of the whole serves as the school's personnel committee, its recommendations to the dean "for promotion and tenure...shall be construed as 'faculty recommendations' in the sense of the Procedures, Sec. B.3."; and

WHEREAS, the clear intent of this proviso is to bring such recommendations under the scope of Procedures, Sec. B.3., but the list of actions to be construed as 'faculty recommendations' in Resolution 91/6 differs inadvertently from the list of actions specified in Sec. B.3. as faculty recommendations requiring a compelling reason for nonconcurrence, and might create needless ambiguity in the authority of these personnel committees; NOW,
THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

THAT the resolving clause of previously adopted Resolution 91/6, under Sec.2. of Paragraph D. of Article IV., be amended by STRIKING the phrase "promotion or tenure" and INSERTING the phrase "appointments and actions affecting renewal of appointments, promotion, tenure designation, and termination of service," so as to read in its entirety:

"2. When the faculty of a school or college, sitting as a committee of the whole, serves as the school's personnel committee, and initiates recommendations to the dean for appointments and actions affecting renewal of appointments, promotion, tenure designation, and termination of service, such recommendations shall be construed as 'faculty recommendations' in the sense of the Procedures, Sec. B.3."

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
March 27, 1992

Adopted April 10, 1992

A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION (91/10)

WHEREAS, William B. Griffith has continued to earn the admiration and esteem of his friends, colleagues, and members of the University community; and

WHEREAS, his present term of service on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has reached its statutory limit; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

THAT the following citation be issued:

In recognition of guidance devoted to his students and wisdom shared with his colleagues at The George Washington University during twenty-eight years of service as Assistant, Associate, and full Professor of Philosophy, and as Chair of the Philosophy Department; and

In recognition of his careful evaluation, patient counsel, and eloquent logic in the resolution of complex issues that arise in the academic community; and

Most especially in observance of his nineteen years of dedicated service to the Faculty while on the Faculty Senate, including two years as Chair of the Educational and Admissions Policy Committee, two years as Chair of the Libraries Committee, five years as Chair of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, and six years as Chair of the Executive Committee:

THE FACULTY SENATE

OF

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

CITES

PROFESSOR WILLIAM B. GRIFFITH

FOR

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Stephen Trachtenberg
Stephen Joel Trachtenberg
President



April 10, 1992

Adopted by acclamation
April 10, 1992

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Philip W. Wirtz, (Ext.4-6369), and Professor Robert T. Smythe, Chair, Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, Ext. 4-6889]

A RESOLUTION REQUESTING RECONSIDERATION OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROPOSED HEALTH AND WELLNESS CENTER (91/11)

WHEREAS, the Health and Wellness Center has been reported to the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, since the time the new Health and Wellness Center was brought before the Faculty Senate, additional budgetary considerations are now known; and

WHEREAS, the exigencies of University income distribution make a reconsideration of capital projects important; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the Faculty Senate ask for a renewal of consideration of the wisdom of constructing the proposed Health and Wellness Center.

Professor Philip W. Wirtz, Senate member
April 10, 1992

Referred April 10, 1992, to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

Referred April 15, 1992, by the Executive Committee to the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting

April 24, 1992
Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting

Defeated, May 8, 1992

TO: Faculty Senate

April 27, 1992

RE: Resolution 91/11, "A Resolution Requesting Reconsideration
of the Construction of the Proposed Health and Wellness Center

The Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee considered the resolution of Professor Wirtz at a meeting on April 24, 1992. The Committee's vote to recommend against the resolution is based primarily on the position that most of the budgetary considerations brought before the Senate at its April meeting were known to the Committee, at least in general terms, at the time of its original decision neither to recommend nor oppose the building of the Health and Wellness Center, and the Committee does not see a strong case for reopening the issue at this time.

In its earlier consideration of the issue, most members of the Committee acknowledged that a good case can be made for the building of the Health and Wellness Center in attracting and retaining students. However, members of the Committee noted that many other worthy projects were also potential high priorities for the use of new funds, and voiced their frustration with the process by which the construction of the Health and Wellness Center had been made a top priority for the use of new funds, apparently without any faculty input into this setting of priorities. These concerns were reported at both the February and March meetings of the Faculty Senate and are recorded in the minutes of those meetings.

P. Levine

Chair
Committee on Fiscal Planning
and Budgeting